

**Section III:**

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121 to the  
DRAWINGS**

No amendments or changes to the Drawings are proposed.

**Section IV:**  
**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121**  
**REMARKS**

**Summary of Telephone Interview**

On May 17, 2007, Applicants' agent, Robert H. Frantz, Examiner Shih, and Primary Examiner Hailu, held a telephone interview to consider amendments proposed by Applicants. The formal amendment made herein adopts these proposed amendments, as it was the general agreement that the amendments likely place the claims in a condition for allowability over the cited art, pending a possible updated search by the examiner.

Mr. Frantz also stated that a supplemental IDS would be filed with the formal reply to submit references from two related, co-pending patent applications being examined by Examiner Kumar. Mr. Frantz stated that the changes proposed herein were similar to those proposed to Examiner Kumar, who also believed they would likely distinguish over the cited art in those cases.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup>**

With respect to rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, the phrase "said step of . . . " was intended to refer to the first element in the Markush group of Claim 3. The Markush group was termed in Claim 3 as a list of "user actions", so the present amendment clarifies this as follows : "said user action [[step]] of . . . ".

With this change, Applicants believe clear antecedent basis is formed. Applicants respectfully withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102, second paragraph.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101**

With respect to rejections of Claims 11 - 15 under 35 U.S.C. §101 for being entirely directed to software, Applicants respectfully direct the examiner's attention to paragraph 0068 in which applicants disclosed alternate embodiments partially or completely committed to hardware (e.g. programmable logic, firmware-programmed processors, application specific integrated circuits, etc.).

Consistent with this use of the term "system", applicants presently amend claim 11 to include clarification that a system has "one or more circuits, one or more programs executed by a processor, or a combination of circuits and processor-executed programs".

Further, as discussed in the following paragraphs, the present invention operates on a system transfer buffer or "paste buffer", which is a memory construct stored in physical memory. As such, the invention provides a physical transformation of matter (e.g. charging and discharging of circuit memory cells, magnetizing of magnetic media to one magnetic polarity or another, etc.).

To clarify this aspect of the invention, applicants are amending claim 11 to recite "a transfer buffer disposed in computer memory other than a file in a file system", and are amending the subsequent operations to specifically recite the transfer buffer.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 11 - 15 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

With respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) of claims 1, 5 - 6, 10 - 11, and 15, over Stern, the amendment to the claims clearly distinguishes over the cited references in the following ways:

(1) Destination-first, source-second copying. Applicants' verbatim quoting (e.g. direct copying) sequence is the reverse of the traditional copying sequence. Normally, a user finds or locates the item to be copied, selects it, operates a copy command, and then selects a location where that copy should be placed. This is a "source-first, destination-second" sequence. Sterns "drag and drop" is such a source-first, destination-second process, where the user first selects an

item to copy (e.g. clicks on the icon of the folder or file), and second drags item to the destination (e.g. on top of the destination icon), and executes the copy command by releasing the mouse button (e.g. "dropping" the dragged item).

Applicants' method, however, uses the reverse of this typical copying process, wherein the *destination* is designated first, then the *source* for copying is designated second. Thus, it is a destination-first, source-second process.

Stern's process is the typical source-first, destination-second process of copying, and Applicants' reverse copying process is not suggested by Stern reference. Applicants' destination-first, source-second process is useful in solving the problems to which the invention is partially directed (e.g. copying the same source to multiple destinations in a single user-operation and concatenating multiple source selections into one paste transfer).

Neither of the secondary references, Tomm or Tsuji, teach or suggest a destination-first, source-second copying process, either.

(2) Use of single transfer buffer to concatenate multiple copied items. Still further, however, the present amendment distinguishes over Stern because Stern appears to teach away from operation on a single paste buffer, instead favoring multiple files stored in a file system as their intermediate form of storing the copied items in transit (*see col. 10 lines 35 - 59*).

This is particularly relevant because Stern says they take this approach distinctly to allow copying of multiple items, which according to Stern is not possible with most clipboard buffers which hold a single item. However, Applicants' inventive process allows concatenation of multiple items into the single clipboard buffer (e.g. our "transfer buffer"), solving this problem in a manner which is not suggested or taught by Stern, Tomm or Tsuji.

As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 5 - 6, 10 - 11, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

With respect to the rejections of Claims 2 - 4, 7 - 9, and 12 - 14, Tomm and Tsuji are relied upon for their teachings regarding rule creation, deletion, and management. Neither Tomm nor Tsuji are directed towards destination-first, source-second processes of copying information from one computer resource to another, and neither are directed towards concatenating multiple selected information items into a single transfer or clipboard buffer.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Stern in view of Tomm in further view of Tsuji.

**Summary**

Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment, and allowance of all claims.

Respectfully,

*/ Robert Frantz /*

Robert H. Frantz, Reg. No. 42,553  
Agent for Applicants  
Tel: (405) 812-5613  
Franklin Gray Patents, LLC